

takes entirely too much time to raise the millions of dollars it takes to run for political office in this country, time that we ought to be spending on the Nation's business.

People are cynical of the system that we now have. After a brief rise in public opinion, it seems, after the last Congress, we are going right back to where Congress has always been in the view of the American people, and that is basically abysmally very low. People look at the huge amounts of money in the system that both parties raise, that all candidates raise if they have any hope of being successful, and they simply do not think there is no relationship between the huge amounts of money being paid out and the actions that are being taken.

That is one of the reasons why people have less and less faith in their Government. It is heavily weighted toward incumbents. As I have said, I have seen it from both sides now, as the old song goes, and incumbency brings the finances that a challenger cannot bring against a well-entrenched incumbent who has had the opportunity to spend the last several years raising money and putting it back. Someone must have the temerity to go out and challenge him and overcome that big advantage the incumbent has.

That is not a good system. It is not serving us well. We can look at the bottom line and tell it is not serving us well. It is not producing the results. Whether it is the fiscal policy or social policy or anything you want to look at in terms of the indicators as to what direction our country is going, it is not producing the results we want to see produced in this country.

There are a lot of problems with any particular piece of legislation. I am sure there are problems with the piece that we will be supporting. To me, it is a much broader and more basic question than whether you have a \$1,000 limit or a \$500 limit or \$250 or \$5,000 or even whether you have PAC's or not. Political action committees were touted as a great reform measure just a few years ago. Now they are out of favor. I do not think it makes any difference. Individuals can contribute around PAC's anyway. PAC's at least are fully disclosed and there are some limitations on them. The same people contributing to the PAC's can contribute individually. So that is all kind of a sideshow as far as I am concerned. I think if we can do something about the overall amounts we will be making real progress.

So I join with my colleague's statement, and I am looking forward to making some progress on this, this year.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, we have heard from several of my colleagues about the need to move forward on campaign finance reform. I wholeheartedly agree—but we must not move forward without reviewing, analyzing, and understanding what those reforms entail.

Campaign finance reform is indeed a very important issue and one that has received increasing publicity and discussion among the American people.

The Senate Rules Committee has taken a bipartisan lead in bringing the full spectrum of the issues surrounding campaign finance to this discussion, and there are many important and significant issues surrounding the reform efforts.

In a series of hearings specifically designed to permit the examination and full discussion of this very important subject, the Rules Committee has heard from Senators MCCAIN, FEINGOLD, THOMPSON, WELLSTONE, FEINSTEIN, and BRADLEY, about legislation they have proposed. We have also received testimony from Members of the House—Messrs. SHAYS and MEEHAN, and Mrs. SMITH—on legislation they introduced in the House.

We have benefited in our understanding of the scope of these proposals from several distinguished lawyers and scholars who have raised significant—and serious—concerns about the constitutionality of some of the proposed reforms. This should cause every Senator to tread slowly, and ensure we have the benefit of full analysis. It remains my greatest concern that many of the reform proposals carry a high risk of being held unconstitutional. The American people would be rendered a serious disservice if we were to knowingly pass legislation which would likely prove to be an empty solution to the problems associated with campaign financing. To this end I have asked—just this past Wednesday—that the chairmen of the Republican and Democratic National Committees provide us with their analysis of the constitutionality of several of the major reform proposals, including: The ban on political action committees; the limitations placed on independent expenditures; and the soft money restrictions placed on the political parties.

In addition to appreciating the constitutional problems with some of the reform proposals, we need to understand the effects of these proposals. We should not head into a darkened tunnel without benefit of a light.

To this end, we heard pros and cons for various aspects of campaign finance reform from prestigious policy institutes—CATO Institute, Brookings Institute, and Heritage Foundation, as well as general calls for significant reform by several advocate groups.

Our hearings have permitted organizations and individuals to provide us with their perspective of campaign finance reform proposals that would eliminate political action committees [PAC's] and the bundling of funds.

We have also learned about the costs and management problems associated with the proposals that candidates for election be given reduced-fee postage. There is no free lunch—reduced-fee postage ultimately means increased prices to the American postal user. This does not necessarily mean the

idea is bad, but we should understand what the costs are and who we are asking to bear those costs.

The committee has also heard positive, thought-provoking testimony about new ideas for reform that should be considered in any campaign reform evaluation. Ideas such as increasing the spending limits to adjust for inflation and increasing the role of the political parties in supporting campaigns.

In our continuing effort to cover the issues in a complete and timely manner, our next hearing is scheduled for May 8. We will bring representatives of the broadcast industry to address the costs and mechanics of implementing the reduced-fee broadcast proposals. We also hope to have testimony on the broadcast industry's efforts to voluntarily provide free broadcast time for the Presidential election—and assess the applicability of this effort to Senate elections.

In addition, we will hear from a panel of experts on the issue of campaign financing and reform, who will hopefully present meaningful analysis of the proposals as well as provide us with concrete and clearly constitutional suggestions for meaningful reform.

These bipartisan hearings are providing the basis for intelligent and meaningful floor discussion and knowledgeable voting when the vote is taken.

We should not proceed without hearing from those who are directly affected; without understanding the constitutional concerns associated with some of the reform proposals; or without permitting those who have studied this matter to present their understanding of the consequences of the proposed reforms and their suggestions for improvement.

I assure my fellow Senators, the Rules Committee will continue to hold hearings at an aggressive pace to cover the remaining issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 4 minutes yielded to the Senator from Tennessee have expired. The Senator from California is informed there are 10 minutes remaining.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair.

ALIEN SMUGGLING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, last evening, I had a brief opportunity to indicate to the majority leader my view of the importance of the illegal immigration bill and my hope that it would be restored to the floor very shortly.

Yesterday, the Justice Department made a series of arrests on the west coast which I believe underscore the need for this bill to be rapidly considered by this Senate and hopefully passed.

Arrests were made yesterday in San Francisco of persons involved in large-scale alien smuggling. They capped a 3-year investigation by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the U.S. attorney in the northern district of California. This operation was

known as Operation Sea Dragon, and the investigation resulted in a sealed four-count indictment of 23 people, all of whom were members of organized and violent gangs.

The investigation revealed that a number of powerful New York-based gangs, including the White Tigers, the Fuk Ching, and the Broom Street Boys, joined forces with two Bay Area gangs to smuggle several hundred aliens from China into the United States in 1993.

According to the U.S. attorney's office, a San Francisco-based Vietnamese gang was responsible for furnishing the fishing vessels to ferry the smuggled aliens from the mother ship to the coast. A Chinese gang operating out of Oakland then arranged for land transportation and drop houses to facilitate the aliens' travel to New York. More than 270 illegal Chinese aliens were detained when the two fishing boats, the *Angel* and the *Pelican*, landed in San Francisco Bay. As many as 15 passengers escaped and an additional 24 smuggled aliens were arrested later at a drop house in New York City.

Initially, five people were arrested in San Francisco in connection with the arrival of the two ships. These five smugglers were sentenced in June 1994 to just—to just 2 years in prison.

What is interesting is that it is clear from the level of sophistication in this particular operation that organized smuggling of illegal aliens is now becoming a huge business. It is estimated at more than \$3 billion a year. It is also clear from the relatively light sentences imposed on those involved that the current penalties do not outweigh the fortune illegal alien smugglers win by breaking the law. And that is the point of my remarks today.

Since August 1991, at least 21 boatloads carrying almost 3,000 illegal aliens have been intercepted in U.S. waters by American authorities, 3 near Los Angeles, 4 outside San Diego, and 3 in San Francisco, including the 2 ships involved in this story.

The State Department estimates that today there are at least 50 ships used by smugglers, or being constructed to smuggle immigrants. Smugglers cram hundreds of illegal immigrants into decrepit ships in inhumane, cramped quarters where all kinds of abuse often occurs. They are often subject to near starvation. They arrive to lives as indentured workers, and they struggle to pay off their crossing debts which reportedly are around \$25,000 to \$30,000.

Currently the maximum penalty for this kind of smuggling is 5 years. The 23 people indicted in these sealed indictments, these sealed arrest indictments, will be charged with 4 counts, including conspiracy, transportation and harboring of illegal aliens. Each count carries a maximum penalty of just 5 years and a fine of \$250,000.

If past sentences handed down in similar cases serve as any indication, it is likely that most of these 23 will serve either a year-and-a-half or maybe

somewhat more. So, less than 3 years will be served for smuggling nearly 300 people into the country. That is one of the reasons why present Federal sentences do in no way, shape, or form deter this kind of activity.

The illegal immigration bill proposed by the Judiciary Committee, and which was taken down by the majority leader, provides much stronger sentences. Federal prosecutors around my State have asked that the Congress increase the penalties against alien smugglers, and the bill does just that. It doubles the maximum sentence for alien smuggling from the current 5 years to 10 years for the first and second offenses. If a third offense occurs, the maximum penalty is increased to 15 years.

The bill would make alien smuggling a predicate act under RICO. This would mean that longer prison sentences could be handed down if other crimes were committed, and in general that the racketeering statutes could be applied.

It would also allow fines amounting to twice the profit made through smuggling to be imposed. And it would change the penalty so that smugglers can be charged with a violation for each person smuggled. Current law makes it one criminal act, regardless of the number of people smuggled.

It would also make any person who knowingly hires an illegal alien or smuggled alien subject to a fine and up to 5 years in prison. It would increase prison sentences for smugglers who bring an alien into this country who later commits a crime, and it would allow asset forfeiture laws to be applied.

The U.S. attorney says to us, if this legislation had already become law, the sentences to these 23 smugglers arrested yesterday would be increased by 50 to 100 percent. Instead of facing maximum sentences of 20 years, they would be 30 to 40 years, and the end result would be that the actual time served would increase.

I would like to particularly congratulate U.S. Attorney Michael Yamaguchi, the INS, and all the Federal agents involved in this successful investigation.

Now the Congress must do its job to see that the laws in place are adequate to deter this kind of illegal alien smuggling. The bill also provides an opportunity to stop illegal immigration—a huge, huge problem in the State of California, with 2 million people there now illegally—the ability to stop it at the borders.

It would include an additional 700 Border Patrol officers. It would include \$12 million for infrastructure, for roads and for fencing. And it would include an additional 300 INS investigators. It would also toughen the so-called employer sanctions promulgated in 1986.

I can only tell you that Proposition 187 passed overwhelmingly in the State of California, the largest State in the Union. If this is not a message that reaches this Congress, I do not know what kinds of actions it takes. So I

would simply like to say, please, majority leader, I say this very sincerely, reschedule this bill soon so the many amendments pending can be considered, so this floor can engage in a practical, a fair, and a just debate, and so that those sanctions that can prevent illegal immigration into this country can be revised and based on modern-day needs.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE EDMUND S. MUSKIE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues from both sides of the aisle in paying respect to a giant of contemporary politics. Edmund S. Muskie, loyal son of Maine, selflessly gave his entire life to public service. His passing is a profound loss, but his shining example of integrity and decency is a legacy for all Americans to admire.

A man of deep intellect, wisdom, and passion, Edmund Muskie graduated from Maine's Bates College to serve three terms as State legislator, two terms as Maine's Governor, and 22 years in the U.S. Senate. He answered President Carter's call to resign from the Senate to become Secretary of State.

As David Broder of the Washington Post has pointed out, Muskie was a politician of rare vision, one who addressed two overriding national issues decades before most others—shifting responsibility from the Federal Government to the States, and putting America's fiscal house in order.

While often supporting activist Government, Muskie recognized that many programs needed to be tailored to the varying situations in each of the 50 States. Indeed, he was ahead of his time. He was the first chairman of the Senate Budget Committee and he fought to keep deficits of the 1960's a minute fraction of what they have become today.

Perhaps standing above all his many achievements is his lead in creating a cleaner environment. He worked tirelessly to create bipartisan support for landmark environmental laws which have allowed our children to grow up in a more healthy and beautiful America.

So today, we pay tribute to a man who cared deeply for his native State, his New England, and his country. We grieve with his family, and hope their time of suffering is alleviated in some way by knowing that America is grateful for his service and shares in their loss. Edmund Muskie, a great man, made the United States a greater nation.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding Minnesotan who has been chosen as the national Teacher of the Year.

A resident of Worthington, MN, Mary Beth Blegen has been teaching for 30